

April 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8259

resolution of disapproval be introduced in the Senate, hearings would be scheduled at an early date, following consultation with Senator RIBICOFF.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government
Operations.

My purpose in submitting this resolution, Mr. President, is so that all sides of this question can be heard. I have received a great number of communications from my constituents in Rhode Island. I have received a number of telephone calls. I have had people call at my office and visit with me to discuss this question. This is quite important.

I realize that we have been assured by the Treasury Department that there will be no deterioration in service. I am inclined to take them at their word. However, this has not been our experience in the past. Not only that, but the man who gives assurance today may not be the man we shall have to contend with tomorrow in case the situation changes.

In order to bring this whole matter within proper focus I exhort and implore the committee to hold hearings immediately so that the matter may be resolved in the public interest. That is the reason I have submitted the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 25, 1965.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I congratulate the senior Senator from Rhode Island on his words. I associate myself completely with his statement. I hope that the holding of the hearings may be expedited and that the matter may be ventilated so that the subject can be worked on in a way which would be favorable to the interest of the people of our State.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should appreciate it if the Senator would permit me to join as a cosponsor of the resolution. With our 1,200 miles of ocean front, our some 17 ports, and our international airports, this matter is of grave concern to my State.

We do not wish this authority to be taken away from State control, through the nominations of the two Senators, and from being handled by State personnel. They are much more familiar with the many problems which exist in this field.

I hope that the Senator will permit me to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator will not only permit the Senator to join as a cosponsor, but I shall be honored to have

the Senator from Florida join as cosponsor. If this action is to take place, it should not take place without a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I should appreciate it very much if the Senator from Rhode Island would permit me to join as a cosponsor. Our State has the same problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I regret that I did not ask for a quorum. If I had, we might have had 100 cosponsors.

I ask unanimous consent also that the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], who is now presiding in the chair as Presiding Officer, be joined as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESERVED WELCOME EXTENDED TO PRIME MINISTER ALDO MORO, OF ITALY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in a time of international tension a pleasant interlude has been the visit to the United States of Prime Minister Aldo Moro, of Italy.

The Washington scene was brightened by the interchange of courtesies between the White House and the official representatives of Italy with no purpose other than sincere friendship.

America's attitude toward this display of amity and the estimate of the daily press is well interpreted in an editorial "Deserved Welcome" in the New York Journal-American of Wednesday, April 21. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESERVED WELCOME

In extending to Prime Minister Aldo Moro, of Italy, a warm personal welcome as well as military honors, President Johnson was in top form. So was the Prime Minister in receiving them.

The President referred to the valuable contributions that millions of Americans of Italian descent have made to this country, as well he might, for those contributions are many and manifest.

Turning to a tenet of American foreign policy, he observed that "no problems can be described as exclusively Italian, or exclusively American, or even exclusively European—there are only world problems today." The President recalled the words of Thomas Jefferson that "peace is our passion—and our purpose is to have peace with honor."

The Prime Minister, who is staunchly pro-West, has his troubles at home. A Christian Democrat, he presides over a coalition of center and left, and undoubtedly there are anti-West, anti-American elements in that coalition.

He has presided with patience and sagacity. If the cordial welcome of the President can add to his strength, so much the better for the United States, Italy, and the free world.

"UNCONDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS," BUT SOUTH VIETNAM MUST STAY FREE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Houston Chronicle of April 9, 1965, published an editorial entitled "Unconditional Discussions," but South Vietnam Must Stay Free."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"UNCONDITIONAL DISCUSSION," BUT SOUTH VIETNAM MUST STAY FREE

The world was told Wednesday night, in language it scarcely can misinterpret, how the administration stands on the situation in southeast Asia.

President Johnson in his speech offered to engage in "unconditional discussions" leading toward peace and at the same time warned the Communist aggressors in Vietnam that we can and will hurt them a great deal more than we have if they continue their aggression.

The two proposals he made are new—that is, new to this particular situation. One is the statement that we are ready for unconditional discussions. Previously the official line has been that the administration would not negotiate until North Vietnam gave a sign it was prepared to stop its aggression.

The other is the offer of a billion dollars in economic aid, plus surplus foodstuffs, to southeast Asia as a part of a cooperative development in which the nations of the area and other industrialized countries would join.

Yet neither of these proposals is new, except in immediate application. The United States, as the President pointed out, has always been ready to negotiate in situations such as this. And there are many precedents for the economic aid offer, notably the Marshall plan in which, in the beginning, Russia and the Soviet satellite states in Eastern Europe were invited to become beneficiaries.

It is significant that approximately half the speech consisted of explanation of our course in Vietnam and repeated expressions of determination that aggression there shall not succeed; approximately half was devoted to what could be done to improve conditions of life in this teeming, backward area.

In the middle were a few sentences devoted to the offer to negotiate—preceded by the assertion that an independent Vietnam is essential and followed by the promise to use our power to see that it remains free.

The President's denunciation of the Communist aggressors, including the Red Chinese, was as forthright and strong as anyone could wish.

The U.S. offer to negotiate without preconditions means the Reds must give up their precondition also—which has been that we must withdraw from South Vietnam before negotiations can start. Johnson made it abundantly clear throughout his speech that we will never withdraw as long as South Vietnam is under attack.

The speech no doubt scored a big gain for our southeast Asia policy. It should promote support from other countries and possibly cause divisions among the Communist nations.

The President has handled the whole situation well in the past 2 months since mounting pressure began to be applied to the Vietcong and North Vietnam. The Communists have been shown what we can and will do to them if they persist in their assault on South Vietnam; the South Vietnamese have been reassured. And now it is from a posi-

tion of increasing strength that we express once again our willingness to negotiate.

PROFILE OF SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we hold a deep respect for the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and we are mindful of our colleague's outstanding service to his country as Attorney General of the United States.

Now that Senator KENNEDY has joined this body, our respect is deepened further as he pursues his duties as a freshman Senator from New York. An account of Senator KENNEDY's daily activities was recently printed in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 18, 1965, in an article entitled "Mr. KENNEDY: Always the Trumpet Sounds," by Andrew J. Glass. I request unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MR. KENNEDY, NEW YORK: ALWAYS THE TRUMPET SOUNDS

(By Andrew J. Glass)

WASHINGTON.—Harvard and Radcliffe students sat on Robert KENNEDY's blue rug while the 39-year-old freshman Senator who feels so close to their generation talked to them of the past and of the new life he was forging on Capitol Hill.

The man who only last year sought to be Lyndon Johnson's second-in-command met 40 eager young faces with a shy smile when an aggressive student, opening old wounds, asked a direct question about the vice-presidential choice.

"Well," Senator KENNEDY admitted, "I was interested in the possibility."

Painful silence hung in the room, a first-floor corner office in the New Senate Office Building tastefully decorated with KENNEDY memorabilia. "Why were you interested?" the student persisted.

RARE CANDOR

BOB KENNEDY replied in fragmented phrases—as he sometimes does when deep thoughts seem to outrun the words available to express them—but his meaning was clear.

"Having gone through October 1962," he said, without elaborating on the Cuban missile crisis. "Being involved in whether my children and other children were going to survive * * * so that's why I was interested."

Then came the crusher: "Were there any political indications that you might be chosen?"

"Well, my family—" the Senator began. All at once, the students were laughing and suddenly the tension was erased.

His recent Senate day had begun with a ride along the Potomac, down Virginia's George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a 1961 Mercury convertible. A faded 1964 campaign sticker reading "BOB KENNEDY for U.S. Senator" was still stuck to the car's rear bumper.

EARLY AUDIENCE

Only one of the nine Kennedy children was still around when he departed at 9:15 a.m. from Hickory Hill, the family home in suburban McLean; Christopher, who will be 2 on the Fourth of July blew his father kisses from the window of the front study.

Brumls, a black St. Bernard that once roamed free in the halls of the Justice Department, wanted to come along. But his master, whose current total working space is considerably more limited, said no.

Twenty-five minutes later, Keith Anderson, who works in the Senator's mail room, swung the car beside the marble office building and BOB KENNEDY hopped out.

Several persons were already waiting to see him in the crowded corner suite. There were phone calls to be answered; hearings to attend. Senator KENNEDY turned from one visitor to another, moving quickly without giving the appearance of being rushed.

Into the blue-carpeted office went Victor Reuther, brother of the Auto Workers' Union president, making arrangements for West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt to see the Senator; and Philip Stern, a writer who with his wife, Helen, had produced an irony-tinged picture book about Washington which he wanted to show the Senator.

At 10, Senator KENNEDY emerged into the hallway, shook hands with a dozen tourists and departed for a public hearing on a juvenile crime bill.

Walking down the hallway, he ran into Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who had just left the hearing chamber. "Let's get together on housing," Senator CLARK proposed, "I hope it won't upset them downtown, but I don't much care."

Keith Anderson was waiting at the wheel of the convertible at 10:45 to take Senator KENNEDY to a television studio, where he was to narrate a filmed account of his recent ascent of Mount Kennedy for ABC's "Wide World of Sports."

The Senator's wife, Ethel, was waiting at the studio, wearing a chic beige dress. "Where did you learn to tie the knots, BOBBY?" she asked, as they watched the climb on a monitor. "In Scout camp," he said.

After the taping session, Senator KENNEDY shook hands with the technical crew and headed back to his office, where the Harvard students were waiting.

As soon as the collegians left, Mr. Whittaker and Mrs. Kennedy arrived. They were joined by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, who had a date for lunch with the Senator.

Chuck Dunlap, 10, having waited for an hour to see him, was ushered into the office. The boy, dressed in a Cub Scout uniform, was selling tickets to a Maryland scout circus at \$1 apiece.

After questioning Chuck for some time about his progress, Senator KENNEDY said: "Well, OK, we'll buy two," and asked his secretary, Angela Novello, to advance the money.

"This is my last dollar," the secretary complained.

"You have to pay for being a national politician," Senator RIBICOFF observed. "They collect not only from New York but here as well."

DOWN AND BACK

Meantime, Mr. Whittaker and Mrs. Kennedy had lunched in the Senate dining room and the Senator joined them briefly to sign the bill. Then he rushed up a flight of back stairs to begin a 2-hour freshman's stint as the Senate's Presiding Officer.

Once in the chair, he donned a pair of reading glasses to study a pile of reports while a desultory debate on the administration's education bill progressed in a nearby empty Chamber.

It was after 4 p.m. when his tour of duty ended.

Senator KENNEDY returned to his office, only to be told that he was wanted again immediately in the Chamber. He paused a moment to chat with Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton, asked leaders of the Rockland County Democrats to walk with him back to the Capitol in the gathering dusk and reappeared on the floor to deliver the longest speech of his Senate career—which lasted 10 minutes.

SENATORS YIELD

A Kennedy legislative aid, Adam Walinsky, had remained up half the previous night preparing the material which, it was thought, would be delivered by Senators CLARK and WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, manager of the education bill.

The two Senators, however, wanted the freshman to speak. When he was through defending the grant formula in the school bill, Senator MORSE, proud as a parent, arose to declaim:

"I say to my friend * * * that only self-restraint prevents my shouting 'Hallelujah. Hallelujah. Amen.'"

Norbert Schlei, an assistant Attorney General, and his wife, Barbara, were giving a cocktail party between 6 and 8 p.m. When the party was nearly over, the Senator having cleaned up his deskwork, left the Hill to be driven to the Schleis' Georgetown home. There, he spent a half-hour nursing a weak scotch, munching peanuts and conversing with his Justice Department successor, Nicholas Katzenbach, about the progress of the voting rights bill.

Departing from the Schleis, the Senator joined his wife at the Georgetown home of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. for a dinner party. Mr. Schlesinger, a former special assistant to the President, is completing a book based on the Kennedy years at the White House.

At 9 p.m. that night, President Johnson, accompanied by his family and Vice President Humphrey, rose in a Baltimore audience to deliver a major speech on Vietnam. At the Schlesingers no one watched the nationally televised speech.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF SIERRA LEONE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today, April 27, marks the fourth anniversary of the nation of Sierra Leone being an independent member of the world community. Today is also the 4th anniversary of Sierra Leone's election as the 100th member of the United Nations. On this landmark day in the history of this country, I would like to extend my congratulations to Sierra Leone and the progress which it has made as an independent nation.

This nation of more than 2 million people is located on that stretch of West African coastline where the mountains meet the sea. In fact the name Sierra Leone, or Lion Mountain, was given by the Portuguese explorer Pedro da Cintra in 1460 who thought the sound of thunder in the mountains resembled the roaring of lions. Freetown, the capital of the country, is situated on one of the finest natural harbors in the world, and nearby are beaches whose beauty is famous throughout West Africa. Early visitors to this coast were John Hawkins and Sir Francis Drake. The first settlement in 1787 was the work of Granville Sharp, leader in the campaign in England against slavery. In 1808 a British colony was established from which enforcement could be imposed in abolishing the slave trade; captured slave traders saw their cargoes freed by the local courts. These persons from all over West Africa became known as Creoles and adopted many of the British ways, while missionaries, many of them American, brought education and Christianity to the colony.

April 27, 1965

act of injustice and tyranny that takes place everywhere on the globe; and every act of tyranny and injustice that takes place here has its influence everywhere in the world. It is not one world in the happy sense that Wendell Willkie imagined it; but it is one world, nevertheless. And its oneness is such that no one can light a fire anywhere in it but that the nation with the biggest fire department has to decide whether to use it or not to use it. And out of that choice enormous consequences for good or evil must flow.

Such is our burden, such our pain and such our anguish. When, as a people, we accept the fact that it is unavoidable and inescapable, the level of debate over what we should or should not do in each recurring crisis will rise. Each of our decisions to use force or to fail to use force is filled with potential pain and injury for millions. This is the anguish that goes with great power. No one can deliver us from it.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles on the situation in Vietnam by Joseph Alsop, Paul Ghali, Richard L. Strout, John M. Hightower, and Keyes Beech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE VIETCONG NOW FEARS DEFEAT"

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In a bitter, hard-fought war, and especially in a guerrilla war, nothing is rarer than a reliable firsthand report on the problems and state of mind of the other side. Nothing like this has been forthcoming in all the many weeks since the first American air attacks on North Vietnam.

Now, however, a remarkably vivid glimpse through the Bamboo Curtain has suddenly been provided by a series of articles in the leftwing Paris weekly, "L'Express," by a French newspaperman who has specialized in Far Eastern affairs, Georges Chaffard. These pieces are so encouraging that one hastens to knock on wood as one reads them.

The encouragement is all the greater because a more unexpected source of encouragement could hardly be imagined. Chaffard is even further to the left than "L'Express," and a hopeful appraisal of American policy in southeast Asia is an unheard-of commodity among European left-wingers.

Chaffard's appraisal is based, furthermore, on the kind of firsthand observation from which Americans are barred. On this round he did not visit Hanoi, but he recently spent much time there. On this round he went to Cambodia and thence moved up to join the Vietcong in the jungle and to talk with leaders of the so-called Liberation Front at their hidden headquarters.

The headline put on Chaffard's articles by "L'Express"—"The Vietcong Now Fears Defeat"—is a good summary of the total impression conveyed. The first point that Chaffard emphasizes is the way the American decision to carry the war to the North has completely upset the strategy of the Communists, who never believed that this was possible.

Point two is the degree to which this decision has changed the climate. "American determination," says Chaffard, has caused everyone to "reflect" a bit.

Third, Chaffard describes the Vietcong as being forced, by the new American decision, to redouble their efforts at the very moment when American air and other operations are significantly reducing the flow

of military supplies and other urgently needed aid from North Vietnam. Chaffard's emphasis on the effectiveness of the U.S. effort to slow the supply-flow amounts to news of the first order; for no one had been sure that this effort was having any effect at all.

Fourth, Chaffard reports Vietcong withdrawal, now in progress, from very large and important areas of South Vietnam for the purpose of regrouping in the less vulnerable mountainous regions north of Saigon. He actually compares this withdrawal with the Communists' pretended departure from South Vietnam in 1954.

Fifth, Chaffard describes the Vietcong in the South as seriously troubled by the weariness of some of their adherents. And he portrays the North Vietnamese as fearful, above all, of just the kind of carefully targeted bombing that President Johnson has ordered, which will destroy the fruit of 10 years of desperately hard work and sacrifice. One must add with great emphasis that Chaffard nowhere predicts abandonment of the struggle by the guerrillas in the South, nor does he forecast acceptance by the North Vietnamese of terms that would also be acceptable to the United States. Instead, he quotes defiant statements by the "Liberation Front" and the northern Communist bosses.

He also says, however, that the "facade of intransigence is not lacking in cracks," whether among the guerrillas or in North Vietnam. He shows evidence that negotiations to end the struggle are already desired in some quarters in the North.

In sum, he does not say that the U.S. effort is succeeding now or assert that it is going to succeed later. But he specifically credits the U.S. effort with getting almost exactly the results that have been hoped for, at this particular stage, by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and his planners in the Pentagon and in Saigon.

BETTER CHANCE FOR UNITED STATES: FRENCH VIETNAM VIEWS CHANGING

(By Paul Ghali)

PARIS.—French experts on Indochina warfare say there is no comparison between the U.S. base at Da Nang and the fateful Dienbienphu basin where they were trapped by overwhelming Vietminh forces in 1954.

If the Vietcong wants to try and turn Da Nang into even a symbolic Dienbienphu, they are heading toward a crushing defeat, these experts say.

The situation of Da Nang—known as Tourane under the French—differs from that of Dienbienphu in two essential geographical and military factors.

First, Dienbienphu lay in a basin cut off by mountains on all sides and easy to besiege. Da Nang is between a stretch of mountain ranges and the sea. Given the immeasurable superiority of the American 7th Fleet over Vietcong naval forces, Da Nang is easy to defend and supply.

Secondly, at Dienbienphu the French were about 160 miles from their source of supply, Hanoi, and relied on inadequate air transport for supplies. The attacking Vietminh were close to their bases in the Chinese province of Yunnan.

At Da Nang the American strategic position is exactly the reverse. The Americans have ample air and sea transport to bring in supplies, whereas the Vietcong are far from their main bases, which lie on the other side of the 17th parallel.

Since Washington decided to send massive reinforcements of troops and material to South Vietnam and has started bombing the Vietcong's supply routes, French military experts appear to have changed their minds about American chances of winning the conflict.

The consensus in French military circles today is that the U.S. military position in South Vietnam has improved considerably in the last month and now creates a situation in which peace negotiations may become possible. President Johnson's cancellation of official visits in Washington and journeys to Europe generally is considered in Paris to be a sign that he wants to give all his time to finding ways to peace in Vietnam.

French diplomats hope that the path to negotiations may be opened by the new prospects of a conference over Cambodia, recently discussed in Washington by the President and French officials. Johnson told them he would like to see a conference on Cambodia and Laos, but he believes the initiative of summoning it should come from Britain and the Soviet Union, as Cochairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference.

The French, who have lately considerably improved their relations with the new South Vietnam government, hold that South Vietnam should be invited to the conference just as much as Red China or North Vietnam.

The new leaders in Saigon are believed here to be far more amenable to the idea of neutrality for southeast Asia than were their predecessors, provided this neutrality gets strong international guarantees.

During a short visit to Paris last week, the Vice President of the Saigon government, Tran Van Tuyen, made significant comments on his country's attitude toward eventual peace negotiations.

He told his French interviewers that his government was hardening in the fight against the Vietcong in order to force Hanoi to agree to peace discussions.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 26, 1965]

THE CASE FOR VIET BOMBING

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Many administration officials feel they are not getting the case for Vietnam bombing over to the American people.

Protests have occurred on 50 college campuses. The latest Gallup poll shows the public deeply split. Controversy is even wider abroad.

What is the administration case?

Here is an effort to give the answer, put together from authoritative sources.

Isn't bombing a "terror" tactic?

The Communist Vietcong wages a ruthless terror campaign. By latest count 450 innocent civilian mayors and officials have been killed, and 1,110-1,200 captured or kidnapped. Sensing victory, the Vietcong doubled terror attacks in the last 15 months, from 171 a week to 350.

This is a dreadful toll in a population of one-twentieth that of the United States. Bombing is the United States counteraction.

MILITARY TARGETS

Doesn't bombing kill civilians?

Not many—certainly nothing to the Vietcong's systematic and calculated ruthlessness. Targets so far are military, not economic. They have improved South Vietnamese morale.

In the past 8 to 10 weeks Buddhists have cleansed themselves of Communist elements; a most encouraging sign. U.S. intelligence sees signs of confusion in the bloc countries and believes the Soviets and Communist China are further apart. There are some signs of division in the government of Hanoi over what punishment to take for refusing Mr. Johnson's "unconditional discussions."

Walter Lippmann and Hans Morgenthau argue that the Vietcong is really one political party in a "civil war." Isn't that correct?

Antiadministration viewpoints are worthy subjects of discussion. But the administration totally rejects the "civil-war" thesis. The Vietcong has around 40,000 regular troops; another 100,000 partly equipped irregulars.

VIETCONG DIRECTION

Take the question of arms: in recent months the South Vietnamese have lost 39,000 weapons; have captured 24,000 from the Vietcong. This net loss of 15,000 weapons obviously is inadequate to equip the Vietcong. In battles, April 5-6, 90 percent of captured Vietcong small arms were Chinese, plus a few Czech; 100 percent of the large-bore were Chinese.

In short, what is considered overwhelming evidence shows the Vietcong depending on outside power for direction, for weapons, for doctrine, and for day-to-day tactical operations.

Well, even so, is it possible to defeat guerrilla tactics?

The United States believes so. Admittedly, the present 525,000 South Vietnamese military and paramilitary is substantially less than the accepted successful ratio against guerrillas. Its inadequacy led to deterioration; bringing United States bombing, starting in February. The United States now is meeting this by stepped-up forces, increased mobility (helicopters), added fire power, close air support, and strategic bombing.

CONFERENCE TABLE AIM

The South Vietnamese now propose to expand their forces by 8,000 to 10,000 a month, for 12 months. This was the subject of substantial discussion at the Hawaii war meeting this past week. The United States has not stopped infiltration from the north but has reduced it.

The past week the United States made 450 air sorties, dropping 900 tons of high explosives. The Americans blew the canopy off the jungle and exposed Vietcong depots on one strike, ultimately destroying this by Vietnamese ground forces.

How about nuclear weapons?

American purpose is to bring the Vietcong to the conference table. They are using merciless tactics; the United States is responding more humanely. Its purpose is to apply pressure, keep them guessing. It does not recognize privileged sanctuaries nor limits on types of weapons used. Communist China must know that the United States could annihilate it. Ho Chi Minh, in Hanoi, must realize his own risk. The United States ought to pursue its objective at the lowest cost to this country.

Using small, tactical nuclear weapons would substantially increase the risk. Washington is also inclined to believe an attack on China would bring Moscow to its defense. The gas incident, stupid as it was, would not of itself debar nuclear weapons. There is no absolute prohibition on nuclear weapons, but they are a threat, not a likelihood.

Are American aerial losses large?

No. They are running about 2 percent of the strike aircraft; about 0.9 percent if reconnaissance and nonraid aircraft are included. The United States had knocked out 16 bridges through last Friday.

How long can this go on?

Ask Ho Chi Minh his time limit. He rejected discussions, even by U Thant of the U.N. and by the neutral countries.

How about a 5-day pause in bombing to test their reaction?

HISTORIC INTANGIBLES?

There is no sign yet that they are interested.

How about the "historic intangibles," that Asia is throwing out whites?

They don't have to throw Americans out; they can't wait to leave. The French were training to stay in for economic advantage. The United States has no economic interest in staying in, whatever. South Vietnamese

leaders appear to realize this; of course, the North Vietnamese charge that Americans are colonists.

Are there flaws in U.S. weaponry? Also—won't the war automatically escalate?

American forces have an absolute blank check on \$50 billions of defense expenditures. There has been no deficiency in supplies. As to automatic escalation, Washington believes that with skill and patience it can control events, not events control it.

How about Communist China—is the United States trying to contain it as it did the Soviets?

The United States sees China slowly increasing its power in the next decades. But it will be a long time—a decade—before it can seriously threaten the American homeland. Ties between the Soviets and China are weakened. It took the Soviets 5 decades for industrialization; China started from a lower base, and it will take longer.

Dissolution of China's ties with its captive satellites (as it becomes "more bourgeois") will be much slower than for the Soviets. Remember—the Soviets were contained. The United States must look forward to trying to contain China.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Apr. 24, 1965]

VIETNAM SEEN AS SINO-SOVIET WEDGE

(By John M. Hightower)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. officials see some signs the growing strains and dangers of the war in Vietnam are widening the split between Russia and Red China—instead of pushing them into a tighter common front against the United States.

The situation is similar in some respects to the growing rift between the United States and France over the southeast Asian war. An important difference seems to be, however, that the Western Allies, being loosely organized in the first place, seem more able to tolerate disagreement than can the Communists, who have a dogmatic need for unity.

The worsening of United States-French relations arises directly from the action of President Charles de Gaulle in reducing French participation in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

Some days ago he sent word France would be represented at the SEATO meeting in London next month only by an observer instead of by Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville. Paris disclosed Friday that De Gaulle is pulling out of SEATO naval exercises in the Pacific.

De Gaulle's purpose possibly is to clear the way for a joint Vietnamese peace effort with the Soviet Union. The Soviet foreign minister, Andrei Gromyko, is due in Paris next week and his scheduled trip helps to dramatize the dilemma in which the Soviet Government finds itself with respect to the Vietnamese war and the conflict with Communist China.

The latest maneuver in the Sino-Soviet quarrel came in Moscow Thursday and was focused on a new unity appeal from Russia to Red China.

But the effect of a speech made by Russia's ideological boss, Pyotor N. Demichev, in a Kremlin ceremony was to put new blame on the Chinese Reds for refusing to follow Moscow's lead in the Communist search for unity.

Thus the real thrust of the speech seems to have been a muted accusation by Moscow that the Chinese Communists by their behavior are making unity impossible.

"Those who prevent our cohesion assume serious responsibility before history," said Demichev. His speech was received here overnight and was getting careful study Friday. He argued that reduction of Moscow-Peking differences is important at this time to increase Communist effectiveness in Viet-

nam. He denied there is in fact any kind of dilemma for the Soviet Union in the Vietnamese situation.

He said that some people—obviously meaning the United States and Red China—say the Soviet Union is in dilemma. He added:

"In fact, there is no such dilemma. The policy for peaceful coexistence does not preclude, but presupposes, a rebuff to aggression and support for peoples fighting against alien domination."

In practical terms this definition of established Soviet policy is taken here to mean the Soviet Union would like to support North Vietnam to the extent necessary to produce Communist victory in Southeast Asia but limit its support to such actions as would not bring on large-scale war between the Communist powers and the United States.

By contrast, the Chinese Communists talk in much more risky terms than the Soviet Union. But they justify their advocacy of all-out support for North Vietnam on the grounds that the United States is a paper tiger and will not itself take serious risk of a major Asian war.

In the contest between Moscow and Peking over which is more devoted to the Communist war of revolution, the Russians are likely to be outbid by the Chinese, who have fewer world responsibilities in their assessment of U.S. power and policy. Moscow's experience in the confrontation over Cuba, in 1962 could have made a critical difference in this respect.

Authorities here believe the Russians in present circumstances would like to find a peaceful solution in Vietnam on terms more nearly acceptable to the United States than would Communist China, which possibly would be glad to keep the Vietnamese conflict raging for years.

Some of the best-informed government experts think the North Vietnamese themselves fear Chinese domination and would prefer cooperation with the Russians. But Russia is too far away to provide the same degree of quick assistance which the Red Chinese can give, and therefore Moscow's influence in Hanoi is limited.

This situation may change somewhat as the Russians begin to make good on promised deliveries of arms to the North Vietnamese. If by such means the Kremlin's authority in Hanoi can be substantially increased, the rest of the world will have a chance to find out whether the weight of Russia's choice would go to peaceful coexistence or to an intensified Southeast Asian war which could rapidly multiply the danger of conflict between United States and Soviet forces.

TIDE IS TURNING: VIETNAM SITUATION BRIGHTER THAN EVER

(By Keyes Beech)

SAIGON, April 12.—The situation in South Vietnam today was brighter than at any time since the war started 5 years ago.

Barring major reversals during the next few weeks, it looked as though the tide of battle has at least turned against the Communists. Not only is the enemy taking a beating in North Vietnam from mounting air strikes. He is taking a beating in the south as well.

Here were the latest developments:

1. U.S. Marine combat strength in South Vietnam jumped to 7,000 men as 3,000 more Leathernecks landed in central Vietnam. This brings the total number of U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam to 31,000.

2. There was no longer any doubt that the marines will get into combat. Although their mission is defensive, they will seek out the Vietcong around their perimeter on the time-tested theory that the best defense is a good offense.

3. South Vietnam's much-maligned armed forces, stimulated by a series of spectacular victories, have clearly seized the initiative

April 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8271

from the Vietcong. They have their tails up. They're charging hard. Any American who repeats the old accusation that "the Vietnamese won't fight" ought to get sued for libel.

There was, in the words of one top U.S. military source, "reason for good cheer and optimism."

The news was so good in fact that Americans on the spot, burned too many times in the past by ill-founded optimism, were suspicious. As if to justify their distrust, there was one cloud on the horizon. South Vietnamese's quarreling generals were at it again.

U.S. military authorities were hopeful they could keep the lid on. So far the disarray among the generals has not affected the war effort. But it could.

Anti-foreignism is quick to surface in politically volatile central Vietnam, hotbed of Vietnamese nationalism and revolutionaries, and American officials take note of this fact by keeping the marines "as inconspicuous as possible."

In Da Nang, where the presence of so many American servicemen has been a source of friction, U.S. officials took a head count of the number of men on the streets on a given night. Liberty passes will be rationed so that even though the number of marines has increased by one-third, the number on liberty in Da Nang at any given time will remain the same.

But it is the South Vietnamese Army and not the marines that will determine the military course of events in South Vietnam. And the Vietnamese were feeling their oats.

In the last few days the Vietnamese Army has scored two smashing victories over the Vietcong—one in the delta and another in central Vietnam.

The delta battle, which cost the lives of 6 American advisers, ended with more than 260 Vietcong dead by actual body count. This was the biggest tally of enemy dead of the war.

Two hundred more Vietcong died in a futile assault on Vietnamese marines in heavily populated Binh Dinh Province in central Vietnam. The solidly entrenched marines, occupying trenches and foxholes previously tenanted by the Vietcong, beat off 10 night attacks. Skyraiders caught remnants of the Vietcong forces as they were trying to withdraw at dawn. The kill ratio has been at 2 to 1 in its favor. In the Binh Dinh battle 19 Vietcong died for every marine defender.

A military spokesman estimated that airpower accounted for 30 percent of the enemy casualties in this encounter.

Perhaps the major factor in the increased aggressiveness of Government forces in the bombing of North Vietnam. Some observers feared that Vietnamese forces would "sit on their hands and wait for America to win the war" once the air strikes on the north began. The reverse has happened.

During the last 2 weeks, Government troops have made contact with the enemy in 55 out of 76 battalion-sized operations—a truly amazing record.

Other factors that account for the change include the use of U.S. jet bombers and fighters in support of Vietnamese ground troops. Now the Vietnamese soldier can see U.S. power, which previously lay idle, at work. This has worked magic in terms of morale.

More artillery and more helicopters have helped. Another important factor is that Government battalions, which a few months ago were down to 200 men or less, are now back up to strength—500 or more.

The changed situation has been reflected in many ways. Intelligence, always a sure sign of which way the wind is blowing in the rice paddies, is getting better. Three recent government victories were based on solid intelligence.

In a country where draft dodging is a highly developed national art, 7,000 Viet-

namese youths last month actually volunteered for army service. Volunteers all but filled the quota of 8,000 men, leaving the army with 2,000 more men than it had sought.

Vietcong morale is low. Jet strikes have had a devastating effect. Hard-core units have become shockingly careless.

"The Vietcong just seem to be going through the motions," said a U.S. adviser in the delta. "Their hearts don't seem to be in their work."

Once all this has been said it must be immediately added: Nobody thinks the Vietcong have given up the fight. Badly as they have been hurt, they remain an effective and dangerous fighting force.

Mass infiltration-invasion from North Vietnam could alter the military picture overnight. And that may very well be happening.

North Vietnam has a hard-fighting army of anywhere from 250,000 to 300,000 men. Regular PAVN units (Peoples Army of Vietnam) have been identified in South Vietnam. What isn't known is how many of them there are inside the country.

According to captured enemy documents, the Vietcong were scheduled to launch a counteroffensive starting Saturday, aiming at sensational short-term victories that would give them a psychological advantage but so far there is no sign of it.

If it happens the Communist drive will be centered in South Vietnam's northern provinces. This has been known for some time, which is why American Marines were brought into that area.

Kontum, in the central highlands, is reported to be one Vietcong objective, which explains heavy U.S. Air Force strikes in that area.

Another Communist ambition is to make a Dienbienphu out of Da Nang. "I cannot think of anything that would be more disastrous—for the Communists—than to try that," said one U.S. commander.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

GEORGE WASHINGTON GOOD GOVERNMENT AWARD TO SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Sunday night I had the very great pleasure of attending the annual George Washington celebration of the American Good Government Society, which is held on the anniversary of George Washington's taking his first oath of office as President of the United States. It is a very fine society. On that occasion, the society customarily recognizes two citizens of the United States, quite frequently distinguished Members of Congress, but always from opposite parties, for their services in behalf of sound constitutional government, and for their services to the Nation generally.

Last Sunday, at that very largely attended dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel, I thought the occasion was a particularly happy one, because the two public servants who were picked out for this very much merited award were both Members of Congress, our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Ne-

braska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the House of Representatives, Representative OREN HARRIS, from Arkansas.

It was my great pleasure on that occasion to present our distinguished colleague [Mr. HRUSKA] for the receipt of that highly merited award, which he so richly deserves for the kind of service which he had rendered as a Member of the House of Representatives and now for years as a senator from Nebraska, but also as a Senator of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Record a copy of my remarks presenting Senator HRUSKA for the George Washington Good Government Award on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HOLLAND ON PRESENTATION OF GEORGE WASHINGTON GOOD GOVERNMENT AWARD TO SENATOR HRUSKA

It is a special privilege for me to present, on behalf of the American Good Government Society, its 1965 George Washington Award to my capable colleague—and my good friend—ROMAN L. HRUSKA, the senior Senator from Nebraska.

There is, as you know, an expression, perhaps overused, "a Senator's Senator." I know of no man who deserves that title more than Senator HRUSKA. Better than most, he comprehends the Senate, its nature and its purpose. I suppose that, in varying degrees, each of the 1,685 men who have sat in the Senate has loved it. But few have understood it better than Senator HRUSKA.

His unflagging attention to his senatorial duties, his uncomplaining willingness to suffer the sometimes outrageous demands of impossible schedules, his unfailing courtesy and regard for his colleagues—all these stamped him early in his first term in the Senate as a man who belongs there.

I don't know how Senator HRUSKA's voting record would compare with my own, for example. I know that we differ on some issues, agree on many others. But of this I am completely convinced: ROMAN HRUSKA's votes are votes based on conviction.

He has not hesitated to cast votes that were "wrong" from the then prevailing political view, but which time and events have often vindicated. His votes are based on long, careful, and scholarly study of the issues. When Senator HRUSKA rises to speak in the Senate Chamber—and this is not so often as some of our colleagues speak—we all listen because we know we will hear a thoughtful, well-reasoned, informed discussion of the subject at issue, and it will be well delivered.

ROMAN HRUSKA has been practicing good government for most of his 60 years. A newspaper reporter not long ago said of him:

"His career is something of an American success story, embodying old-fashioned virtues like thrift, hard work, independence, and a steady progress toward a goal."

Your presence at this dinner tonight shows that you find nothing unattractive (old fashioned) about the virtues of good government, honest government, able government, compassionate government.

ROMAN HRUSKA believes that good government requires work. He is intimately acquainted with both. It is my pleasure to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Although his senior position on the Judiciary Committee requires a great deal of his time, and he carries a heavy load there, still he comes to the Appropriations Committee, fully informed, well

briefed—sometimes to the discomfiture of witnesses from the executive branch.

But then, ROMAN HRUSKA has worked all his life. He carried papers as a boy, worked his way through college and law school and still managed to do well scholastically. His debating skill first flowered as a member of the high school debating team in Omaha. His sharp instinct for the fine legal points of complicated legislation was developed during a successful law practice.

His high regard for the tax dollar showed itself during his membership on the Douglas County Board of Commissioners in Omaha. While he was its chairman, the board achieved seven straight reductions in the county tax levy.

That concern has in no way lessened during his splendid service in the House of Representatives and now in the Senate, where he sits on a committee which each year considers a budget of \$100 billion. But Senator HRUSKA is no advocate of sweeping, indiscriminate slashes in the budget. He is a champion of a strong military, he believes in a responsible stewardship over natural resources—and in our agriculture subcommittee he is an articulate and effective spokesman for soil and water conservation—he is committed to a national policy of growth under a free and expanding economy.

Although we represent different political parties, I would like to believe that ROMAN and I represent similar political philosophies. We both want for this Nation and for our children and grandchildren, a future which is secure and productive under a government that is our servant—not our master.

Together we reject the alarmists who cry doom, because we share an abiding confidence in the greatness of America—a greatness rooted not here in the marble halls of Washington, but in the people of America—the people in Omaha, Neb., in Bartow, Fla., in Bangor, Maine, and in Oakland, Calif.

This confidence in the people was held by George Washington, in whose memory and honor this award is made. But Washington recognized that it would require great vigilance to protect the liberties which the people had won. In his Farewell Address, he counseled:

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

These words are as meaningful today as when they were uttered nearly two centuries ago. In choosing ROMAN HRUSKA for this award, the society has honored a man completely dedicated to constitutional government, a man who believes that government must be limited by the people, a man committed to integrity in government, both fiscal and moral. In brief, he is a man who believes with Washington in "the benign influence of good laws under a free government."

Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, it is a great personal pleasure for me to present to you this award in recognition of your record of distinguished leadership and outstanding achievement in the field of good government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think Senators will be interested in reading the exact wording of the resolution, made so deservedly, about our distinguished colleague, Senator HRUSKA.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the resolution of tribute and honor to Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA from the Amer-

ican Good Government Society on that occasion.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF TRIBUTE AND HONOR,
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

Lawyer, statesman, and businessman—has served 8 years as county commissioner; one term in the House of Representatives and for more than 10 years as U.S. Senator. Throughout his entire public career, he has been a hard-working friend of the taxpayer. During his 7 years as chairman of the Nebraska Douglas County Commissioners there were seven straight tax rate reductions and the bonded debt was retired. In his single term in the House he was an effective member of the Committee on Appropriations; in the Senate his fiscal and legal talents led naturally to places on the Appropriations and Judiciary Committees for these talents were highly regarded by fellow Senators of both parties. Candor, courage, intelligence, and industry have marked Senator HRUSKA's life. These qualities make him a tower of strength and support of the principles of the Constitution of the United States, the blessings of liberty they endow, and the republican form of government they bestow.

H. G. ROBERTSON,
Chairman,

J. HARVEY WILLIAMS,
Secretary

(For the Board of Trustees, American Good Government Society).

APRIL 25, 1965.

Mr. HOLLAND. On that occasion, in responding, after receiving that award, our distinguished colleague made a very fine address, and I ask leave at this time to have incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, extracts from the remarks of Senator HRUSKA. Incidentally, with his accustomed modesty, he took out some humorous portions of it. I assure the Senate, however, that it was a very fine address, as Senators will see from reading it. It contained some fine comments. It also gleamed with humor and was full of good American common-sense and observations.

I ask unanimous consent to have those extracts from the remarks of Senator HRUSKA on that fine occasion printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM THE REMARKS OF SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA ON RECEIVING THE 1965 GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD OF THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 25, 1965

The introductory remarks of the senior Senator from Florida are most generous and highly appreciated.

It is truly rewarding to be closely associated with him in the Senate, in committee, and otherwise. Primarily, of course, because of the valued lessons one learns in the difficult and complicated task of creating sound legislation and rejecting unwise proposals. His long years of dedicated service over wide areas of public interest have made his mind and intellect a veritable treasurehouse of information and judgment. With ease he draws so precisely upon this past experience for almost any situation which might arise.

Over and above his activities as a lawmaker, however, are the human, compassionate qualities of which he is inherently and abundantly possessed.

It is always with genuine courtesy that he strives to be helpful to all with whom he

works and believes to be sincere in the common effort to advance the work of the Congress. In fact, Senator HOLLAND, while I thank you most deeply for your generosity, I would like to say that you seemed to have borrowed especially heavily from your ingrained gentlemanly and even courtly cooperation with your colleagues in doing so.

But I hasten to add that your remarks are most pleasant to my ears, as undeserved as they may be.

The American Good Government Society pays me high, but unearned, honor in selecting me for this award. The list of the previous honorees is in itself eloquent testimony to the richness of this distinction, and to the difficulty of measuring up to its high requirements.

I accept it because I aspire to deserve it, and shall keep trying to do so.

I accept it because, like you, I am completely committed to the principles which the society seeks to foster and defend—the principles of good government, of a government of laws administered by wise, able, and compassionate leaders and representatives responsible and responsive to the people; that is to say, a government truly by the people.

It is well that there exists a Good Government Society. Perhaps at no time in the 176 years since George Washington's first inaugural have we been more in need of a reminder of the proper role of government.

Today we are at a crossroads which will determine not whether we actually have one form of government or another, but even whether we will be able to debate a meaningful choice.

We are not talking about the survival of capitalism, or of constitutional government as systems—we are talking actually about their survival even as ideas.

Indeed when it comes to the great choice that we should be considering, our normal political and organizational activities are not of primary concern. We must first decide in our own minds, hearts, and souls what sort of nation we wish to have. Only then can our political and organizational efforts be directed powerfully and unswervingly toward fulfillment of that choice.

Our Founding Fathers made such a decision some 200 years ago.

They decided that man was meant to be free; to have a maximum opportunity to project throughout his entire life the equality he possessed when he was created; and to have opportunity to possess, develop, and enjoy those certain unalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—with which he was endowed by his Creator.

They decided to institute a government truly of the people, in order to make man's mission a reality.

To institute such a government, they had to strike down a government holding and exercising almost unlimited power based upon claimed divine right of kings. That government had been guilty of denying freedom to men. It had been guilty of a long train of abuses, "injuries and usurpations all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States."

The Revolution won, government domination over the individual was banished. Shackles were stricken from human initiative. A nation was founded in which each citizen had certain rights which he could assert against everyone else, including his own government.

This was done by restricting and limiting the powers and the scope of government.

There followed the development of a people of many great capacities and attributes: a willingness, in fact an eagerness, to work diligently, for they knew that they could keep the fruits of their labor for their use

April 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8321

"And none of these areas recently." Mr. Speaker, we only have to look at the events of the past few years: the burning of the Freedom Riders' bus in 1961 at Anniston; the Birmingham church bombing and the resulting deaths; the situation in Selma and the murders of Rev. James Reeb and Viola Liuzzo; All the acts of terror and violence, all of the acts which deny the rights of human beings, were ignored by the gentleman from Alabama.

So his speech is really a subterfuge, an effort to camouflage and to cover up the situation with which we must deal by creating a climate of hysteria. The thesis that Negro citizens are not denied their rights in Alabama is patently and demonstrably false.

Let me quote from the President of the United States when he addressed Congress on March 15 in the aftermath of the atrocities in Selma and the use of mounted posses and billy clubs to suppress those exercising their constitutional rights. President Johnson said in his message:

The denial of these rights and the frustration of efforts to obtain meaningful relief from such denial without undue delay is contributing to the creation of conditions which are both inimical to our domestic order and tranquility and incompatible with the standards of equal justice and individual dignity on which our society stands.

The President clearly understood that there would be those who, like the speaker this afternoon, would in the President's words, "appeal to you to hold onto the past." These people, the President said, "do so at the cost of denying the future."

The Civil Rights Commission reported the denial of voting rights in Alabama. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS], mentioned the low state of Negro registration in that State. Only 23 percent of the Negroes in Alabama are registered to vote, and in many counties the Negro registration is zero or practically zero.

The chronicle of violence is well known to all of us; and look at the terrible toll in lives. In the past 2 years 11 persons have been murdered for participating in civil rights activities in Alabama. This is how the expression of legitimate grievances is suppressed. The simple, clear fact is that in Alabama as in Mississippi and other areas, Negroes do not receive simple justice. It is not necessary to recite the grim statistics which moved the President and stirred the conscience of this Nation. The civil rights movement has struck a responsive cord in all Americans who believe in freedom and justice. It has stirred the conscience of America, and it was the conscience of America which poured out and marched from Selma to Montgomery—men and women, old and young, black and white, of all faiths and religions.

In the march were religious leaders, rabbis, priests, ministers, nuns, those who have devoted their lives to serving God and humanity. They marched because they understood that humanity was at stake in Selma, Ala., and they will march

again, for no amount of character assassination, no attacks even from the floor of the House of Representatives are going to hold back the onward march of history nor quiet the aroused conscience of America.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward, as we seek to fulfill the meaning of liberty and justice, there will be attacks; there will be efforts to derail the onward march of history; there will be smears and innuendoes; but in the long range of history it will be recorded that one of the finest hours was the hour when citizens from all over the United States answered the call of Rev. Martin Luther King and marched with him those many miles, day and night, from Selma to the capitol at Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, let us put aside the petty attacks and the snide smears and the innuendoes. Let us realize that the question of equality and justice is at stake as never before in America, and that we as Members of Congress have an obligation under our oath to fulfill. Let us fulfill it by passing an effective voting rights bill, a bill which will make it unnecessary for us to come back to this floor again as we have since 1957, in 1960, and again in 1964 to assure this basic right to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is crystal clear that the irrelevancies and the efforts to besmirch the Selma-to-Montgomery march are only being used to divert attention from the injustices to fellow Americans. The relevant question is: Are the demands of the Negro citizens of Alabama just and legitimate? Let us not be misled by those whose purpose is the perpetuation of the injustices we all know violate the Constitution and our cherished concept of freedom.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which I have obtained this afternoon follow the special order and comments of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S APPROACH TO VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1965, one of Texas' most influential newspapers, the Paris News, published by Walter Bassano, at Paris, Tex., made this objective and, I think, particularly wise editorial observation regarding President Johnson's handling of the Vietnam issue. It is well worth our attention. The editorial follows:

[From the Paris (Tex.) News, Apr. 13, 1965]
PRESIDENT'S APPROACH TO VIETNAM PROBLEMS
OFFERS REASONABLE RECOURSE

President Johnson's recent policy speech on Vietnam might be interpreted as an extension of the carrot and stick philosophy. The proposals have certain pitfalls such as the onus of a peace bribe or an attempt to buy peace; they also have certain advantages such as repudiating U.S. power or territorial designs and confronting the Communists with the necessity of talking or shouldering the blame for continued warfare.

The President's offer of a billion dollars of economic development assistance regardless of whether there is peace is something easier held out than delivered. Congress will want to look closely at whatever aid is extended to obtain some faint assurances that the investments will not be in vain or an intermediate venture on the way to the hands of the enemy.

However, there is this much to say for the President's suggestions—they represent an attempt to break out of the same old formula which often carry the seeds of their own destruction because of inflexibility or lack of imagination.

Negotiating from strength does not necessarily mean whip 'em and dictate the terms. It does mean strength of purpose as well as of armed might to the degree that we will not be harassed into compromising a principle—the principle that the Vietnamese are entitled to work out their destiny in freedom from the insidious pressures and infiltrations of international communism.

Until there is disposition to do something about outside masterminding of the Vietnam, then the supplies of the Cong need to continue to feel the sting of air attacks. Attrition works two ways.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES OF SELECTED FOREIGN COUNTRIES PROVIDING FOR PREFERENCES FOR DOMESTIC MATERIALS AND FIRMS IN THE AWARDED OF PUBLIC SUPPLY AND PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as are all Americans, with our Government's monetary and economic policies. Today, the two most persistent economic problems facing the United States are our unfavorable balance of payments and unemployment.

While our present unemployment level is acute, should there be a downturn in the economy, this situation would become critical. Pennsylvania had 233,000 persons unemployed during March. The Nation as a whole had 3,740,000 persons out of work during the same period. We are faced with an inescapable and unavoidable responsibility to provide employment for these unfortunate fellow citizens. The Appalachian program, the Manpower Training and Development Act, the antipoverty programs and other proposals are splendid ideas and promise dividends in higher employment, but we must be relentless in our fight to create more work for our labor forces. The President's economic report for 1965 calls unemployment "the greatest test

April 27, 1965

now confronting our general economic and manpower policies." I submit that Congress should continue to support measures which provide that moneys expended by this administration will be used for the benefit of the people of this country.

The balance-of-payment deficit and the outflow of gold poses far more complex problems in that internal actions alone cannot eliminate this deficit but could reduce it substantially. In the main our trade and tariff policies have been formulated to coincide with our foreign policy requirements rather than considered in conjunction with our current unemployment problems.

This country is committed to efforts to end our balance-of-payments deficits, and I would remind my colleagues that this administration pledged itself to eliminate this deficit. Congress has been asked to enact various measures to strengthen our checks on foreign use of U.S. capital markets. The Secretary of the Treasury has been asked to enroll our banking community in a major effort to limit lending abroad. American industry has been requested to limit direct investments in foreign countries. The Department of Defense and the Agency for International Development have been directed to cut overseas spending to the bone. Finally, our citizens have been encouraged to "see American first."

Whether these various measures will be adequate is not yet determined, but it is clear to me that we should carefully analyze our trade policies and the policies of other nations in their entirety if we are to rectify these pressing problems. It is the nontariff barriers imposed by others, nations that have by great measure contributed to our present balance-of-payments deficit.

Let me make my position clear. I am not blind to the need for dealings with the other trading nations of the world, but I ask that we keep in mind the fact that we are beset with acute problems that are directly related to our foreign spending policies.

If we are to maintain our economic and military commitments to other nations with the attendant gold outflow we should at the minimum be afforded reciprocity by foreign governments in the field of public procurement policies.

Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that our Nation is to be committed to correcting our international balance of payments on the one hand while, on the other, we are to permit Federal contracts to be awarded to foreign concerns? This possibility especially concerns me when I consider that the major trading countries of the world discriminate against foreign industry in favor of their domestic concerns.

I submit that the individual taxpayer has a right to ask that his Government buy domestic products because that taxpayer has contributed his money toward procurement of those services and supplies. Purchases from domestic concerns are sound and logical from an economic viewpoint if all factors are considered.

For example, a Government agency recently procured some supplies from a foreign supplier at a cost of \$500,000 and contended that it had saved the Govern-

ment approximately \$100,000. A careful analysis of this procurement would have disclosed that such a savings was not, in fact, achieved by our Government. If the procurement had been made from a domestic concern, a considerable percentage of the money involved would have been used to pay local, State, and Federal taxes. Additional tax revenue would have been achieved from the necessary procurement of raw materials necessary to produce the manufactured products desired by the agency. Further, the workers necessarily employed to produce the raw materials and the manufactured items would have received several hundreds of thousands of dollars in wages, part of which would have been applied to their social security funds, pensions, payroll taxes, along with a corresponding decrease in unemployment compensation that many otherwise received.

One major domestic industry has recently estimated that at least 30 percent of every dollar collected from the sale of the product involved eventually goes—through corporate, personal, property and sales taxes—to Federal, State, and local taxing bodies.

Mr. Speaker, advocates of free trade may label my case for domestic preference of public supply and public works contracts as an attempt to return to the days of isolationism and protectionism. Domestic preference is neither isolationism nor protectionism. As a matter of fact, it is the accepted way of transacting public business in almost every major trading country in the world. For example, in a recent staff study made by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, the following statement concerning foreign procurement policies of the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—is made:

The State Department has obtained reports from U.S. embassies on the foreign procurement policies of all OECD countries which indicate that * * * various practices hamper or restrict the opportunities of foreign firms to compete for Government contracts.

The study further states:

Practices which limit the opportunity to compete for Government contracts include such things as * * * exclusive preference to domestic firms; regulations which preclude foreign bidding on Government contract.

In summary, few other countries have defined their "buy national" policies as publicly as the United States, but widespread administrative discretion generally permits them to show preference for domestic firms.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the Bureau of the Budget staff study was made, a complete compilation of domestic preference laws and regulations of the major world trading countries was not available. However, such a compilation is now available. I shall introduce beginning today for inclusion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a two-volume report, prepared by Joseph W. Marlow, associated with Cravath, Swaine & Moore of New York City, which report substantiates the fact that the major world trading countries, such as Japan, France, Italy, Canada, the United Kingdom, and some 27 others do, in fact, favor their domestic concerns to the almost complete exclusion of U.S. products.

The report that I shall institute cites chapter, page, and verse from the laws and regulations of these major trading countries, proving that a domestic preference program exists in each one of these countries.

I submit that the policy of domestic preference pursued by these major trading countries is a sound and logical policy. The United States must be as wise as these countries have been and recognize that domestic preference is good for the country and its citizens.

Japan, for example, has recently recognized that domestic preference does, in fact, benefit the nation. On September 20, 1963, the Japanese Cabinet issued a "Buy Japan" decision, justified in part as follows:

In order for the Japanese economy to attain growth at the rate expected by the Government, the Government should take the lead in carrying out such measures as are within its jurisdiction to take, while keeping the international payments in balance, and at the same time voluntary cooperation should be expected from the industrial and financial circles.

It is therefore decided that correct evaluation for domestic products * * * be established and that effort be made to encourage the use of domestic products by the Government and Government agencies, in order to prevent the outflow of foreign exchange through unnecessary imports and to promote the domestic industries.

Our Nation, with its similar problems, must be equally as wise and recognize that domestic preference is in the Nation's best interests.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I submit that public procurement of foreign supplies and services should be held to an absolute minimum. My daily remarks will prove that such action would be in step with the practices and policies of the major world trading countries. Such action would also be compatible with our national interests regarding balance of payments, gold reserves, employment, and real net cost.

I produce this material not to castigate or condemn our foreign friends, but only to demonstrate that it is unorthodox as well as idiotic for our own Government to spend public funds for materials that, if supplied by domestic producers, would provide employment for Americans, bring taxes into all levels of government, and improve our balance-of-payments position. In the midst of our current make-work programs, how can we justify buying materials from alien sources to the exclusion of U.S. industry and labor?

The one justifiable alternative to the policies and practices of foreign governments described in the following study is for our own Government to buy from producers and suppliers in the United States—not as a retaliatory move but only as the reasonable answer to America's unemployment and balance-of-payments problems.

INTRODUCTION

In a staff study on the "Foreign Procurement of the United States Government" made in 1963 (and released in April 1964),¹

¹ Printed in Appendix 3 to the Transcript of Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, Apr. 16 and 21, 1964.

April 27, 1965

A1967

munists deface an embassy or wreck a library and achieve millions of dollars worth of international publicity for their cause. The Americans make a diplomatic protest and in contrast receive the replacement of broken window panes and defaced walls. This is not quid pro quo. They reap a propaganda harvest and this great Nation receives, in the minds of their stooges, only another black eye.

Permit me to portray for you what will undoubtedly happen if peace is negotiated in Vietnam. In 1954, the Communists requested the convening of a Geneva Conference to settle the Korean question at a political level. At that time it was evident that a malevolent political trick was about to be perpetrated. This was manifestly evident to the Korean Government which declined to attend the conference. The terms of reference did not include plans for reunification of the country or the establishment of a free democratic government. At the specific request of the U.S. Government, I did attend as one of the representatives of the Republic of Korea.

However, I made one request that, after 2 months of negotiation with the Communists and if basic issues were not resolved for which the conference was called, the United States and Korean delegations would withdraw. The U.S. Government assented to this request. After a brief 2 weeks the U.S. delegation was convinced that the Communists did not come to Geneva to settle the Korean question but alternatively to lay the groundwork for further aggression in Vietnam. You are aware of the results of the debacle in Geneva. Korea today is a divided nation as is Vietnam, and 11 million residents of this latter nation have been brought under Communist domination and tyranny. It is good to know that the United States was not a signatory to this agreement. The so-called Geneva modus vivendi serves as, but another example of the manner in which free nations are tricked into appeasement and concessions to the Communists.

Since 1954 it has come to my attention that many sincere and honest Americans favor the neutralization of Vietnam. They and all Americans should appraise the situation of a neighboring country—Laos. The experience of the Laotians serves as a frightful reminder of the fact that no neutrality could exist in the land immediately adjacent—Vietnam or anywhere else.

During the course of my stay in your Nation, I have traveled the length and breadth of this great country, urging steadfast opposition to communism. Had the Korean war been won, there would be today no problem with the Communists in Korea, Vietnam, or in other nations of southeast Asia. The Korean war is the only war in which the United States has participated in its history which was not concluded by a decisive victory for your Nation. A stalemate in Korea has resulted in encouragement to the Communists to carry out their aggressive designs upon not only Indochina but also the Middle East and the continent of Africa.

After signing a cease-fire agreement in Korea, the United States is still maintaining 60,000 soldiers in a rugged line facing the ever-hostile Communists across a so-called demilitarized zone. The attitude and conduct of your troops has been punctiliously correct. On the other hand, the Communists continuously violate the armistice agreement and endeavor to infiltrate spies, saboteurs, and provocateurs into the free Republic of Korea. Viewed in the light of the correctness of American conduct, Communist provocations are each day becoming more intolerable.

What is the solution to the dilemma with which the free world finds itself faced? It is not to be found in appeasement, concessions, or retreat either before a propaganda blast or after a politically motivated military assault.

We of the nations of the free world must be willing to hold hands in fellowship and determination to preserve our way of life. We must have understanding, appreciation, mutual respect, and an unshakeable determination to make secure what we hold dear. When a coach dispatches a football team to the field, he does not instruct the representatives of his alma mater not to cross the 50-yard line. No such restriction has been, and I doubt ever will be, placed upon the predatory forces of communism. They are out to win and to win for keeps. Unrealistic restrictions should not be imposed upon the forces of the free world who today, tomorrow, or 5 years from now may be called upon to defend their wives, children, and homes.

One of your greatest Presidents said freedom is for those who are strong enough and are willing to fight for it. Your forefathers set the pattern in 1776. If you remember to stand up and be counted, your precious freedom will be cherished by you and your children. I thank you.

Establishment of a Greek Theater in Ypsilanti, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the establishment of a Greek theater in Ypsilanti, Mich., is nearing reality. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a newspaper article describing this unique theater be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS,
APRIL 23, 1965, BY CURT HASELTINE

Ground will be broken early this summer in Ypsilanti, Mich., for the first Greek theater to be established outside of Greece since Euripides.

Although the exterior of the \$4 million structure will be modern classic, the seating for 1,900 and the stage arrangement will be patterned after the classic theaters of Athens and Epidaurus.

The theater, designed by Architect Harry Weese & Associates of Chicago, will be located on the banks of the Huron River in downtown Ypsilanti.

The Ypsilanti Greek Theater group was organized in 1963 to provide a cultural center but the germ of the idea goes back more than a century to the man who gave Detroit its street plan.

Judge Augustus Woodward named Ypsilanti in 1825 in honor of Gen. Demetrius Ypsilanti, the "George Washington" of the 1820 Greek revolution against Turkish domination.

A statue of General Ypsilanti erected there in 1928 by the International order of AHEPA is the focal point of an annual pilgrimage commemorating Greece's fight for freedom.

Now the Ypsilanti Greek Theater, scheduled to open in 1966, will present classic Greek plays in English using specially commissioned translations to recapture the theatrical strength of the original plays.

The theater will not be devoted solely to Greek classic plays, but will also present folk songs and dances, operettas, musical comedies, and concerts.

It is also expected to serve in the interim periods between festivals as a civic auditorium for lectures and conventions.

The building will include a smaller theater with a seating capacity of 250 to be used as an auditorium for smaller groups. Plans also include a permanent library and study center with a collection of Greek art and sculpture with regularly scheduled exhibitions.

Alexis Solomos, for 14 years artistic director of the Greek National Theater in Athens, will serve as the first resident artistic director of the Ypsilanti Greek Theater.

A local fund drive toward the \$4 million cost has already raised \$200,000. Interest has also been shown in the project by the Greek and French Governments as well as AHEPA, the nationwide Greek organization of America.

The movement expects aid from the Greek Government and private individuals, and cultural organizations in Greece. The French consulate in Chicago has expressed interest in having French attractions in the festival cycles. AHEPA has agreed to a fund solicitation by the Ypsilanti Greek Theater among AHEPA members.

Mrs. Clara G. Owens, a teacher on leave of absence from the Wayne public school system, is the president and moving force behind the theater project. Stephen T. Spilos of Detroit is a vice president; Nicholas T. Georges, Detroit, treasurer.

The Ypsilanti site for the Greek theater is only 30 miles from Michigan's largest city by freeway (I-94); near the Eastern Michigan University campus and barely 10 minutes' drive from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, and less than a half hour from Greenfield Village, which is visited annually by more than 1 million travelers.

Further indications of success can be seen in a broad national renaissance stirred by the Lincoln Center of the Performing Arts in New York City, and the planned John F. Kennedy Memorial Center for the Arts in Washington, D.C.

It is felt that the Greek theater can do more for Ypsilanti than the Shakespearean festival has done for Stratford, Ontario, and that it can become a major U.S. cultural attraction for tourists from overseas.

Ku Klux Klan Disloyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following column by a fine newspaperman, Ralph McGill. I hope that loyalty to the country will increasingly prevail against the disloyal activities of the Ku Klux Klan:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
Apr. 15, 1965]

FORMER KLANSMAN A GOOD PROPHET
(By Ralph McGill)

Bill Hendrix, of Oldsmar, Fla., after many years as a Klansman of high rank—such as, grand dragon and wizard—publicly announced retirement as head of the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in early January 1961.

He had to choose between loyalty to his country and the Klan, he said. And since the Klan had become an enemy of his country, by turning to dynamiting and other

A1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 27, 1965

forms of lawlessness, he felt that an honest American had no choice save to get out. He did.

Now, in 1965, Bill Hendrix has written the House Un-American Activities Committee offering his cooperation and suggesting the committee schedule a meeting in the Tampa or St. Petersburg area.

In this letter to the committee Mr. Hendrix said:

"While in Atlanta, Ga., in 1959 at a national Klan rally, those of our group withdrew from Klan activity and requested all Klan groups to disband. Later we gave out a story to Ralph McGill and he printed the story which had nationwide attention.

"We still say the Klan must operate outside the law under its present programs * * * I believe if you will look on your records you will find that the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan has a long record. * * * We disbanded because we found that a Klan group could not operate without going outside the law. The very name Klan to many people today means working outside the law and many of the new Klan leaders know nothing about the law and care less.

"We believe that the southern politicians are to blame for the plight of the South and that such as Faubus, Barnett, and Wallace are wrong and are the cause of most of the unlawful actions now being practiced in the South."

In a postscript to the copy of his letter to the House committee, former Dragon Hendrix suggests that the original statement of withdrawal might be published. It is at hand.

Worried because a criminal element was obtaining control of some Klans, Hendrix said, 6 years ago:

"I can no longer agree to such things as bombing and burning schools and churches. * * * Twenty years ago when I joined the Klan I took an oath that I would obey and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its political subdivisions. All Klan members took that oath. * * * I stated frankly that under the law I saw no way out but to accept the court orders on segregation.

"I am certainly for segregation' I told the Klansmen, 'and have said so from the public platform for more than 20 years. But, I am not going out and bomb and burn schools and commit crimes some people in the Klan are proposing. We of the Southern Knights hold the honor of not ever having had a member in trouble for violating the law. I want all you Klansmen to remember that you and I took the same oath. * * * I have held every office in the Klan and I know that the Klan is going to get lawless."

There is not room for all Hendrix's statement and letter of almost a decade ago. But he was a good prophet. The Federal Bureau of Investigation found ties with Klans in the bombing and killing of Sunday school children in Birmingham, in the horrible murder and hiding of the bodies of the three young civil rights workers in Mississippi, in the killing of an unoffending and unarmed woman on the highway between Selma and Montgomery, and in many other violent crimes.

Time was when decent men did get into the Klans. Most of them long ago saw, as did Bill Hendrix, that the several Klans were headed toward actions no decent American could condone. They got out.

We trust the House Un-American Activities Committee will use what help Hendrix can offer. Certainly the Klan, as President Johnson has said, and as the record demonstrates, is un-American in effect and action.

Management of News in the Southeast Asia Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in his Saturday column for April 24, Dolph Simons, Jr., publisher of the Lawrence, Kans., Journal-World, comments in a very telling way on the management of news in the southeast Asia area.

I hope Mr. Simons continues to hit this critical subject—and I intend to share his comments with the Congress. Freedom of the press, and accurate news reportage, are essential to our national purposes all the time—just as much in time of war and danger as in time of peace.

Mr. Simons most recent column follows:

THE SATURDAY COLUMN

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

Reports issued the past 10 days at the American Society of Newspaper Editors meeting in Washington and at the American Newspaper Publishers Association's annual convention in New York can't help but make the public wonder if it is being told the truth or is being fed propaganda about the war in Vietnam.

There is no question but that U.S. officials in Washington and Saigon have tried their best to color, distort, and censor the news coming out of the Asian country. They have refused to allow American reporters into certain military areas, they do not allow American military personnel to talk to reporters and they have tried to attach misleading importance and evaluations to many situations. This is happening at both ends of the war, at the Pentagon and in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, the American public doesn't seem to be concerned about this dangerous attempt by the Government to control the news even though American casualties are increasing week by week.

It is difficult to understand this lack of interest about Vietnam, since there's no question that America is going to become more and more involved, more men will be killed, the cost to American taxpayers will keep soaring, and there is the possibility this "limited" war could plunge Uncle Sam into an all-out war with China or Russia.

American newsmen are trying their best to report the war, but our own officials are not allowing the public to know what is going on. George Beebe, president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, pointed out the American public is not getting either "the full story or the true story" on the Vietnam war.

To make matters even worse, the U.S. Information Agency has been given the assignment of handling the press briefings in Saigon. This is an American propaganda agency set up to try to make the United States look good throughout the world, and here it is serving as the official voice of what is going on in Vietnam. USIA controls the military briefings and has set up regulations about news policies regarding air strikes, and the ground rules under which American newsmen have to operate. The Pentagon

and the White House evidently not only approve of this controlled news, but are encouraging it.

How can the public have confidence in its Government and statements of its officials, whether it is about Vietnam or the cost of Medicare, if Government spokesmen think it is all right to spoon-feed the public in the field of news? Various well-qualified spokesmen in Washington and New York hit hard at deliberate attempts by our Government to mislead the public by either withholding news or telling only part of a story.

When an elected Government official thinks he is powerful enough to control the news, censor the news and deliberately mislead the public, it's time to watch out. This is what happened in other countries prior to the ruthless takeovers of such men as Hitler, Peron and others.

The press is trying to report the news in Vietnam and to inform the public on what is actually taking place. American citizens are going to have to become more concerned over this censorship and voice their opinions to Representatives and Senators to bring about a change.

Reapportionment in Ohio—Issue No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, in Ohio, next month, an election will occur which will determine to a large degree the civil rights of Ohio citizens, white and Negro, for many years to come.

The election in question concerns reapportionment of the State Legislature in Ohio, and is known as issue No. 3. This issue is a nonpartisan one, Mr. Speaker, and is concerned with the essential right of the majority of the people of Ohio to receive a majority of the legislative seats in the legislature. Compared below are the last three Ohio House of Representative election contests:

[In percent]

Year	Percentage majority party vote statewide	Percentage of House seats won by the majority party
1960.....	53	53
1962.....	53	53
1964.....	58	58

We see here, Mr. Speaker, that for the last three elections, the majority party, as indicated by the vote of the people of Ohio, received a minority of the seats in the legislature.

If this had happened in any of the undemocratic nations of the world, where electoral systems are rigged by tyrants and demagogues to assure minority rule, we would be shocked. The citizens of such countries would look upon their electoral systems as unworkable shams,

"Mr. Kaiser, have you ever entertained any thoughts about retiring?" I asked.

His voice was curt, "No." Then he added more pleasantly, "I don't see any sense in it as long as you are able to think and give others an opportunity to do things."

As we drove up to the entrance to Kaiser's estate, where an electric eye slides open the iron gate, he said to Nolan, "Be sure and give me those plans for the marina, I want to rest some more."

The USIA, Art and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the U.S. Information Agency has decided to stop its sponsorship of American art at the two most important international art exhibitions, the biennials at Venice, Italy, and São Paulo, Brazil.

This decision is somewhat astounding when one considers the record the United States achieved in the two exhibitions in which the USIA participated. In 1963 the American artist Adolph Gottlieb won first prize at São Paulo, and in 1964 Robert Rauschenberg won top award at Vienna.

Whether or not one appreciates modern art, it must be admitted that winning these two prizes is an outstanding accomplishment and can do the American image among the other nations of the world no harm.

It was not long ago, I remember, when the cultural accomplishments of the United States were represented in a German students' parade by a huge, familiar soft drink bottle. The art awards at the biennials have helped to impress the people of the world that our Nation stands preeminent in the arts just as we do in science and technology.

In the face of all this, however, the USIA has decided to quit. It seems a little like a poker player leaving the game after winning two big hands.

Apparently the USIA made the decision in the name of economy. It will cost approximately \$111,000 to sponsor the American exhibit at the 1966 Venice biennial and \$69,000 for the 1967 São Paulo showing. I am loath to believe that economies could not have been achieved somewhere else which would have allowed continued participation.

After all, every other nation participating thinks it worthwhile to underwrite the cost of its artists' exhibits. Further, private sources have previously attempted to sponsor the U.S. show, with a notable lack of needed funds—and certainly less success than the USIA.

The situation recently was described by Mr. Frank Getlein in his art column for the New Republic. Mr. Getlein, editorial writer for the Washington Star, believes that the USIA terminated its sponsorship of the exhibits principally out of fear of congressional criticism.

USIA officials were, in other words, trying to save us Philistines from ourselves.

Believing that Congress is not antagonistic toward art, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the USIA take another look at the situation to see if the money can be found which would allow continued participation by the agency in these biennials.

At this point, I would like to include the article by Mr. Getlein which appeared in the April 3 New Republic, and urge the attention of my colleagues to it. The article follows:

ROGER AND THE RABBITS

There used to be a migratory farmworker named Lenny who, in moments of stress, would ask his buddy, "Tell me about the rabbits, George." And George would spin an implausible yarn about the good times to come when the pair would own their own little piece of ground and Lenny would get to take care of the rabbits. And while the story lasted Lenny never noticed that they were out of work and starving, that the rain was coming down or that the angry mob was getting closer.

It is just possible that Roger Stevens, who is shaping up as this country's answer to André Malraux, is really charged with telling us about the rabbits. Stevens, who is chairman of everything in government having to do with the arts, from the John F. Kennedy Center to the new advisory council, is the man L.B.J. instinctively thinks of when he thinks of art and the reason is plain enough. Stevens is second only to the master himself in conjuring up visions of America as the Athens on the Federales in the golden time to come even as the men arrive from the finance company to carry off the icebox.

The other day, for example, Stevens enthralled the Nation with a word picture of live theater in every shopping center, or at least in the larger ones. Why should people in Oshkosh have to journey to New York and pay exorbitant prices to see "Mary, Mary" and other works of theater art? Why indeed? Under the Stevens plan they can stay at home, drop in at their neighborhood shopping center and catch "Barefoot in the Park" between the dry cleaners and the supermarket. What's more, it can be done with a \$3 top. The sets can be standard and built by local carpenters, thus spreading around a little prosperity and cutting down rehearsal time and shipping costs. There'll be plenty of free parking—eventually, no doubt, it'll be drive-in live theater. And best of all, it won't really cost any money. It can all come out of FHA insured mortgages. The Government provides only the financial confidence needed, not the actual cash.

This general approach has been criticized by some as an over-concern with buildings and a simple unawareness of what goes on or could go on or ought to go on inside the buildings. Fair comment. It is also fair comment to note the characteristic belief that in the arts you really can get something for nothing, that you can carry on like Pope Julius without every laying out any money at all. But it is preeminently futurism, the story of the rabbits.

For while Stevens was staging his chain-store theater scheme, the men from the finance company were closing out one brief and staggeringly successful fling of the American Government in American art. Early in the New Frontier, Stevens' predecessor of fewer title, August Heckscher, persuaded the United States Information Agency to take up the job of American representation at the two most important international art exhibitions, the biennials at Venice and at São Paulo. Before that, for decades, the United States had been represented by

various methods. The pavilion at Venice, for example, had been built and run by a New York art dealer, Grand Central Galleries, which eventually turned the building and the job over to the Museum of Modern Art, which more often than not farmed out the exhibition to some other institution. This practice contrasted with that of all other nations represented in both shows, for in all cases the capital investment and the expenses were laid out by the several governments. The feeling of foreigners seemed to be that nations as such had a direct interest in their own art both at home and abroad. Until Heckscher, this was beyond the grasp of American Government officials. Now it has eluded them again.

The record of USIA participation has been spectacular. In 1963 they went to São Paulo and came out with the first prize, awarded to Adolph Gottlieb. In 1964 they went to Venice and came out with the first prize, given to Robert Rauschenberg.

In recognition of this remarkable record, top USIA officials, presumably working in close collaboration with the Bureau of the Budget under the Johnsonian anti-frill principle and in permanent holy terror of the Congress, dropped the program completely. The 1965 participation of São Paulo, since work has already begun on it, will be allowed to take place. But after that, nothing, in either show. It is the opinion of the budget-composer that the responsibility should be given to the American "art community."

Well, of course, there isn't any American art community in that sense. The lobby doesn't exist. If a Government agency or a secretary to the Senate majority wants to do business with the aerospace or vending machine industry, there is a "community" organized and ready for bids. Not so in art. What the budget really means is that the Great Society, in its actual working, doesn't give a damn about American art and is not about to. The "great socialites" will be glad to hit up Mary Lasker for a few free tulip bulbs to plant along the mall. They will also accept as gifts or long-term loans any approved contemporary art that an artist or dealer wants to present free for hanging in our embassies around the world. A recent breakthrough will apparently allow the executive offices to participate in the same free load, even if the artists haven't been dead 20 years. And in the manner devised by Napoleon, we may expect more medals all around as other artists are tapped to join Willem de Kooning as Great Society painter. But money? No.

The money required is about \$80,000 a year to finance American participation in both shows. This would come out of a USIA budget of over \$170 million and is thus pretty tiny as these things go. Since the budget was drawn up and submitted before the agency decided to close out various of its sacked libraries, it may be presumed that money could be found even without specific budgetary listing in the event that Congress or the Presidency suddenly decided to back up the golden words with one golden deed.

It used to be standard practice to blame Government indifference or hostility to art on Congress and there was a presumption that Congress was, in however crude a manner, fairly representative of the country's feelings on the subject. Those feelings, if we can believe anything we read, are in the process of change and it is probably true that Congress is less hostile to art than ever. Unfortunately, as far as the USIA programs are concerned, we shall never know. All we know is that whatever the feelings of Congress, the feelings of this agency are negative.

The Museum of Modern Art unloaded the program in the first place because its board felt representation was properly a function of the Government—as it is in all other countries showing art in Venice or São Paulo—and because the expenses, tiny for

April 27, 1965

the USIA, were becoming overwhelming for a single museum. The Modern, therefore, is not going to constitute itself the "art community" and pick up the ball from where USIA's economy flende have dropped it. The American Federation of Arts in theory could represent the "art community," but in this case almost certainly won't. There is some interest within the Smithsonian Institution, the art apparatus of which—under the title of the National Collection of Fine Arts—is showing a vitality unimaginable a couple of years ago, but the obstacles are formidable since representation of art abroad can hardly be called either research or the instruction of American citizens.

There is an excellent chance that the America of the Great Society will be simply unrepresented at the major international exhibitions after 1965, unless, perhaps, Roger Stevens can work out a no-cost method of getting art shows into shopping centers and shipping a shopping center over as a sample of our culture.

First Anniversary of Establishment of United Republic of Tanzania

SPEECH
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the establishment of the United Republic of Tanzania. On this important day, I want to extend my warmest congratulations to that rising young African nation, to its President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, and to the people of Tanzania. The 26th of April is Union Day in this African nation, rather than Independence Day, because it was on this day just one year ago that the two new African nations of Tanganyika and Zanzibar embarked upon the enormous project of combining their two countries into a single nation.

Nature started Tanzania off with the basic fundamentals with which to build a nation—above all, a vigorous people, important values and traditions deeply imbedded in their society, a variety of mineral and agricultural resources having important developmental potential, and exciting touristic possibilities. Starting with their present endowments, Tanzanians, like our own Nation nearly two centuries ago, have set about working out for themselves the physical, political, and cultural foundations for a thriving new nation.

They, and they alone, have the heavy responsibility for deciding the real future of their nation—the kind of government they want in the longer run; the type of society they should develop as they mature as an independent people in today's world; how much they want to keep of the old and the traditional; how much they would like to bring in of the new and the modern. They must determine how to get the schools, the teachers, the doctors, the hospitals, and the formidable array of other assets they want and need.

As this young nation of Tanzania struggles to create a unified and prosperous nation, we Americans may well feel both nostalgia and admiration. A hundred and seventy years ago and more, we, too, were a small, very new nation going through much of the same struggle with many of the same problems as this young nation now celebrating its first birthday. So today, I ask my fellow Americans to join me in expressing our friendship for the nation and peoples of Tanzania, as they pass this important milestone in their country's history.

He'd Defoliate the Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the startling resemblance which our actions in Vietnam bear to the recommendations of Senator Barry Goldwater has been noted by more than one writer. It is certainly fair to conjecture as to whether or not the courses of action which we are now taking were contemplated by the strategists of the Democratic Party, even while their spokesmen were loudly crying "warmonger" in the late months of 1964. A "before and after" picture of the situation is clearly defined in the column entitled "He'd Defoliate the Jungle" which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of April 1965. The article follows:

HE'D DEFOLIATE THE JUNGLE

As the Democrats never wearied of telling us, Barry Goldwater was a dangerous man. He would spread the fighting in Vietnam, bomb across the 17th parallel into Communist territory, and—horror of horrors—he even thought of defoliating the jungle. Why, before you knew it, we might find ourselves in a—well, in a war.

But, as Art Buchwald has comfortingly pointed out, we were spared all that, and things are in the calm, competent hands of Lyndon Baines Johnson, who would never think of dropping a nuclear bomb on an innocent little girl plucking daisies. What a relief it is.

But somehow this fellow Goldwater must have snuck by the Secret Service men and got into the White House and pressed the panic button, for here we are informed, with every evidence of pride, that U.S. air-men have tried to start the biggest jungle barbecue in history.

Having first doused the whole forest with chemicals to kill shrubbery so that the fire would burn more swiftly, a fleet of 75 aircraft swept back over the Boi Loi jungle and splattered tons of petrol, jellied gasoline, and incendiary bombs on the woods, starting an immense fire aimed at rooting out the entrenched Communist forces infesting the forest.

The fire was intended to defoliate an area 50 miles square, and got off to a roaring start which caused one happy American military spokesman to chortle that "it was going great." It burned steadily for 12 hours, but then the heat of the flames produced a thunderstorm which doused the biggest conflagration since the Chicago fire. We suppose

that this will not discourage Dr. Strange-water from trying again, for, as a certain reckless politician once said, "When you remove the foliage, you remove the cover."

Well, we must join Mr. Buchwald in rejoicing that we have a man in the White House who would never do such things.

A More Accurate Look at the Rayburn Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, for some time now since the Rayburn House Office Building has been opened to the press and public, a deluge of criticism has been heaped upon it. The press reports would lead one to believe that the 169 senior Representatives who sought tenancy in the modern building were thoroughly disenchanted and straining to get out.

A more accurate picture of the situation is reflected in an editorial which appeared in our congressional newspaper, Roll Call, on April 22.

The author of the article, Roll Call editor and publisher, Sidney Yudain, is probably one of the most astute reporters of the Capitol scene, having been participating in, observing and interpreting congressional activities for some 15 years. The phenomenal 10-year success of Roll Call and its acceptance by the Congress as its "official paper" is due in large part to its grasp of congressional sentiment and feeling, often beyond the reach of other publications.

I believe Mr. Yudain has done a service to the Congress and to the public in pointing out that aside from a few annoyances common to every new home occupant, Congressmen are, as a whole, well pleased with the beauty, efficiency, and setup of their new functional offices. I believe that Mr. Yudain also voices the prevailing opinion of the taxpaying citizens when he points out that upon visiting these offices they are consumed with pride in the facilities provided for their elected Representatives.

The editorial follows:

IN THEIR HEARTS

Now that the rumbling and grumbling over the Rayburn House Office Building has risen to a crescendo, let's take a good, honest look into what the situation really is.

No doubt the building is expensive. No one denies that costs mounted throughout the construction due to unforeseen changes. Even after construction, myriad faults were found and corrected at additional expense.

But now the lucky 169 Congressmen and a variety of committees have moved into the spacious quarters. What is the honest-to-goodness reaction of those actually occupying the building?

Some few are discontented about some facets of their new quarters. But in their hearts, they know they've never had it so good.

Most of the Representatives are tickle-pink over their new quarters. Some staffer

Knock on Wood**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 16, 1965.

Despite unjustified criticism, it should be apparent that President Johnson's policy in Vietnam is having the desired effect.

The article follows:

Knock on Wood

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In a bitter, hard-fought war, and especially in a guerrilla war, nothing is rarer than a reliable firsthand report on the problems and state of mind of the other side. Nothing like this has been forthcoming, in all the many weeks since the first American air attacks on North Vietnam.

Now, however, a remarkably vivid glimpse through the bamboo curtain has suddenly been provided by a series of articles in the Leftwing Paris weekly, "L'Express," by a French newspaperman who has specialized in Far Eastern affairs, Georges Chaffard. These pieces, first spotted in this country by the astute Crosby Noyes, are so encouraging that one hastens to knock on wood as one reads them.

The encouragement is all the greater because a more unexpected source of encouragement could hardly be imagined. Chaffard is even further to the Left than "L'Express" and a hopeful appraisal of American policy in southeast Asia is an unheard of intellectual commodity among European Leftwingers.

Chaffard's appraisal is based, furthermore, on the kind of firsthand observation from which Americans are debarred. On this round, he did not visit Hanoi, but he quite recently spent much time there. On this round, he went to Cambodia, and thence moved up to join the Vietcong in the jungle, and to talk with the leaders of the so-called liberation front at their hidden jungle headquarters.

The headline put on Chaffard's articles by "L'Express"—"The Vietcong Now Fear Defeat"—is a good summary of the total impression conveyed. The first point that Chaffard emphasizes is the way the American decision to carry the war to the north has completely upset the strategy of the Communists, who never believed that this was possible.

Point two is the degree to which this decision has changed the climate. "American determination," says Chaffard, has caused everyone to reflect a bit.

Second thoughts have been especially common in the group of greatest importance to the Communists—the wavering people in the middle who were getting ready to back the Communists because they expected the Communists to win in the end.

Third, Chaffard describes the Vietcong as being forced, by the new American decision, to redouble their efforts at the very moment when American air and other operations are significantly reducing the flow of military supplies and other urgently needed aid from North Vietnam. Chaffard's emphasis on the effectiveness of the U.S. effort to slow the supplyflow amounts to news of

the first order; for no one had been sure that this effort was having any effect at all.

Fourth, Chaffard reports Vietcong withdrawal, now in progress, from very large and important areas of South Vietnam, for the purpose of regrouping in the less vulnerable mountainous regions north of Saigon. He actually compares this withdrawal with the Communists' pretended departure from South Vietnam in 1954.

Fifth, Chaffard describes the Vietcong in the south as seriously troubled by the weariness of some of their adherents. And he portrays the North Vietnamese as fearful, above all, of just the kind of carefully targeted bombing that President Johnson has ordered, which will destroy the fruit of "10 years of desperately hard work and sacrifice."

To this, one must add with great emphasis that Chaffard nowhere predicts abandonment of the struggle by the guerrillas in the south, nor does he forecast acceptance by the North Vietnamese of terms that would also be acceptable to the United States. Instead, he quotes defiant statements by the liberation front and the northern Communist bosses.

He also says, however, that the "facade of intransigence is not lacking in cracks," whether among the guerrillas or in North Vietnam. He shows evidence that in some quarters in the north, negotiations to end the struggle are already desired.

In sum, he does not say that the U.S. effort is succeeding now, or assert that it is going to succeed later. But he specifically credits the U.S. effort with getting almost exactly the results that have been hoped for, at this particular stage, by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and his planners in the Pentagon and in Saigon.

President Johnson's policy and its implementation to date have not previously received a stronger implied endorsement from a more curious or more convincing source. That does not mean the Vietnamese war will be easily terminated. Much rougher times, perhaps quite serious reverses, may now lie ahead. But it does mean that what Chaffard calls "American determination" is neither empty nor ineffectual.

The Lonely War in Vietnam**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years, I have been advocating the application of veterans benefits to our fighting men who are serving in combat zones, such as Vietnam.

The situations there are as grave and arduous as those experienced by servicemen in World War II and Korea and these men are to be commended for the gallant way in which they are struggling in southeast Asia and provided with the rewards of a grateful Nation.

This situation is brought home even more clearly than ever in an article by Charles W. Wiley in the May 1965 edition of the American Legion magazine. Mr. Wiley describes the life of American servicemen in the Mekong Delta with clarity and compassion. I would like to share this with my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE LONELY WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Charles W. Wiley)

(NOTE.—An intimate report on the lives of four GI's at an isolated outpost of the Mekong Delta portrays the new kind of war.)

Americans serving in the field in Vietnam are fighting the most terrible and loneliest war that the United States has ever been in. Outside the cities and large military bases, the GI is in danger every minute of every day. He can never relax. At night he must fight a more-or-less conventional guerrilla war. During the day he must be constantly on guard against a terror attack. It isn't even entirely safe in Saigon or at our largest bases.

This is a new kind of war in Vietnam, unlike anything that we've experienced before. There's no "front" in the sense that we ordinarily think of one—a frontline; then support positions (mortars, etc.) farther back; then, often miles from the first line, artillery; and finally a safe rear area for reserves, rest, command, and supply services. The American military sleeping in the barracks in the big hotel that was blown up in Saigon a couple of months ago were about as "far back" as you could get. Out in the more conventional combat areas, what stands for a normal frontline, are a number of isolated positions, frequently encircled as well as infiltrated. There, infantry, support units, and artillery are all jammed together, sometimes side by side. Each unit is normally somewhat in the position of the Lost Battalion of World War I with respect to its disposition. The enemy is everywhere—and nowhere.

Even worse than the fact that there is no fixed front is the fact that there is no way of distinguishing friend and foe. When an American goes down a country road or walks through a village marketplace, every single person whom he passes may be the enemy. The peasant in the field, peacefully working with a hoe, may be a Communist terrorist with a submachinegun hidden in the grass 10 feet from him. After the GI has passed he may—or may not—get shot in the back. The Vietnamese riding through town on a bicycle may have a hand grenade in his pocket. So might the shopkeeper, or one of the shoppers, or the pretty girl with the wide straw hat and colorful native dress.

Americans have a wry joke about identifying the Communist Vietcong (commonly known as VC): "It's easy to tell a VC from a friend. The VC is the one who shoots at you."

But often by the time the difference is clear it's too late.

Let's look at our GI's in the cities and villages, and then visit a lonely outpost where I spent last Christmas.

GI's are especially good targets for terrorists because they are usually much taller than the average Vietnamese and stand out in any crowd. Even if all they are doing is going to eat in a local cafe, Americans almost always go in small groups or at least in pairs, and in addition to sidearms generally carry automatic weapons and grenades. They never walk side by side, but move instead in a stagger formation, changing the distances between them from time to time, never taking the same route twice in a row. This changing of patterns is very important in making ambush planning more difficult for the VC.

But there are limits to these defense maneuvers, and the GI's all know that the VC can, if willing to take a calculated risk, set up a trap at any time.

To add to their security problem, they are followed everywhere by crowds of happy Vietnamese children. As part of their voluntary job of being good-will ambassadors, the Americans always return greetings from local people. They smile and carry on conversations with friendly Vietnamese while keeping alert for terrorists.

April 27, 1965

A1990

It's a tough job—and one that lesser men would make easier for themselves. The GI's could hide within well-defended positions during the day, but the United States would lose face if it were shown that Americans were frightened by the VC. Vietnamese morale would suffer, so our boys keep the U.S. flag flying by purposely making themselves targets.

This business of being diplomats and good neighbors at the same time that they may be in combat or ambushed, at any moment of the day at any place in Vietnam, is remarkable in itself.

Air Force and Army units stationed at Tan Son Nhut Airbase near Saigon have adopted the Thanh Man Orphanage were war widows and their children have joined hundreds of parentless youngsters. Doctors and a dentist from the base hospital go regularly to treat the children. The GI's provide food and have distributed clothing sent from their families in the United States. During off-duty hours, the Americans have helped construct new buildings. One major project was digging a well for fresh drinking water. Servicemen contributed \$2,500 with additional money coming from collections at church services held on the base, for just this one undertaking.

Marine and Air Force units at Da Nang have been involved in similar activities. An orphanage adopted by the Air Force has so impressed the Vietnamese that the Communists issued orders for the assassination of one U.S. doctor who had taken special interest in the project.

Many U.S. personnel have made it a routine to make fatherly visits to Vietnamese war orphans. During the last Christmas holiday season, American units all over Vietnam held parties for the local children. Many of them knew nothing about Christmas, but understood and appreciated the good will and gifts given by the Americans.

One who has almost made a career out of being a good Samaritan is U.S. Navy MMIC. Philip G. Ambrose, from Philadelphia, Pa. He volunteered to extend his tour of duty in Vietnam so that he could carry on his one-man good will mission. Ambrose has "adopted" six Vietnamese military hospitals, plus Vietnamese Army and Navy units. "OK, Joe," as Ambrose is known by the Vietnamese passes out gifts of all kinds supplied by donations from the United States and money taken from his own pocket.

This is not to say that every single American serviceman in Vietnam is a great guy. There are a few—especially in the bigger cities and at larger bases—who behave badly. But most Americans in Vietnam, including most of the support cadres, are dedicated to defending the United States and helping the people of that war-torn country.

I spent the Christmas holidays with four typical U.S. Army advisers in the field. They were attached to the 1st Battalion of the 7th Division, Army of Vietnam (abbreviated ARVN, with the abbreviation converted to the word "Arvin" by Americans in Vietnam who use it when referring to members of the South Vietnamese armed forces—an Arvin soldier). The battalion was stationed in the town of Mo Cay, Kien Hoa Province. It is in the Mekong Delta area, about 50 miles southwest of Saigon, the scene of some of the heaviest fighting in Vietnam.

The Americans were Capt. Roger D. Harms, age 27, of Shenandoah, Iowa; 1st Lt. Craig V. Hansen, 26, Manhattan, Kans.; Sgt. Ralph M. Shoemaker, Jr., 28, Chattanooga, Tenn., and Sgt. Herbert J. Huston, 30, Marina, Calif.

All four were career men who decided long ago to make defending the United States a full-time job. They were the only Americans in Mo Cay. Captain Harms, an Infantry officer with 10 years' service, came up through the ranks. Lieutenant Hansen, an engineer, trained as an Airborne ranger. He was graduated from West Point in 1962.

Sergeant Shoemaker had 8 years' service in the Infantry. Sergeant Huston first spent 4 years in the U.S. Marines, including duty in Korea during the war there. An Airborne ranger, he had 8 years of Army service when I visited Mo Cay.

All volunteered to fight in Vietnam. Captain Harms had two boys, aged 2 and 6, and a baby girl born after he left the United States. Sergeant Shoemaker had boys of 5 and 8, and another baby was scheduled to be born while he fought in Vietnam. Sergeant Huston had a 3-year-old son. Of the four, only Lieutenant Hansen was single.

All of them volunteered to fight in Vietnam because they believe that it's their duty to defend the United States; and that the frontline of our defense is in Vietnam. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "We would rather fight for our country and families here than in our own backyards."

All were proud of being professional soldiers of the United States, and deeply resented any confusion between professional soldiers and mercenaries. They chose careers as military men primarily to serve their country. Army life as a means of earning a living and as a source of adventure were secondary reasons. They did not join the Army to make money, and were bitter about those who claim that professional soldiers could not compete with civilians for jobs.

All four were gentlemen. They were not the type described in cheap blood-and-guts novels. Although they walked with heads held high, befitting men who are proud of their uniform, they did not swagger. Sometimes one of them let go with a mild cuss-word, but even though they usually were far from anyone who understood English, they did not use foul language.

The Arvin battalion held Mo Cay and a small strip of ground around the town. The total defense perimeter was about 1 square mile, bounded on two sides by narrow canals. The entire area was surrounded by a barbed-wire fence and defense positions.

Outside the town itself the VC was in almost complete control at night except for a few outposts along a key highway leading to the next province. During the day the VC more or less melted away, but it was still unsafe to leave the town other than with a full battle-ready military unit. Daylight ambushes in the countryside, or even along the road, were common, and helicopters were frequently shot at while landing or taking off at Mo Cay in broad daylight.

We at home have read a good deal about the shooting down of some of our helicopter men. To them too it is a unique and lonely war. There is no such thing as being over friendly or enemy territory, and any flight is a "milk run" only if when it is over nothing has happened. The helicopters can even be in battle and not find it out for a while. While Vietcong machineguns (which are deadly at low altitudes) reveal themselves promptly when using tracers, the Vietcong has also developed a system of concentrating tracerless, small arms fire against choppers. The loud noise of the helicopters' engines and whirling blades can sometimes drown out the sound of such gunfire. During a previous flight on the same day that I rode with him, a gunner first learned that his copter had been fired at when he discovered that the heel of his boot had been shot off.

The situation in December in the Mo Cay area was illustrative of the really big problems of the war in Vietnam. The Arvin and American advisers had the responsibility of keeping the local economy moving and improving normal civilian conditions, so that we were always fighting to defend—to keep the roads clear, to keep trade and commerce running, etc. The gates of Mo Cay were kept open to allow peasants and townspeople to carry on normal business—even though it also meant allowing Vietcong terrorists to enter.

We also had to defend the people, because Vietnamese civilians were frequent targets of the Communists whose goal is to so terrorize and demoralize the population that the Vietnamese will eventually surrender on any terms as a means of stopping the torture of their bleeding nation.

The Vietcong, on the other hand, do not defend anything, they only destroy. Under these ground rules, the Communists have a tremendous advantage: they pick the time and place to fight the war. They can mass the necessary forces at the point of contact, while the Arvin are stretched in a long thin line that can be cut at all but the strongest points.

The Vietnamese soldiers, despite reports to the contrary, have conducted themselves well. It is true that Arvin officers sometimes lack initiative, and some Vietnamese have failed to meet the deadly challenge of combat. But the problem of limited initiative is largely due to war weariness, intensified because for a long time there seemed to be no real determination to win a victory against the Communists on the part of the free world. Stepped up U.S. participation and the State Department's white paper on Red aggression of February 26 is the sort of stuff that can make even better fighting men of the Arvin. The failures in combat have been largely among paramilitary units such as home guards. The nonprofessional Vietnamese soldiers have behaved like similar men in armies throughout history; some good, some bad—some excellent, some terrible. The Arvin regulars have done a very commendable job, and Americans who have served in the field with them almost always have high praise for their fighting ability. The four U.S. Army advisers in Mo Cay, and every other American combat veteran that I spoke to in Vietnam, were favorably impressed with these Asian soldiers.

Nuygen Van Duc, who received news of his promotion from captain to major on Christmas, commanded the Arvin battalion at Mo Cay when I was there. He was a 20-year veteran, rated by the Americans as an excellent officer and a fine person. One interesting sidelight is that he was especially kind to the Christians under his command during the Christmas holidays, although he is a devout Buddhist.

The four GI's in Mo Cay lived in a house only a few feet from the defense perimeter where two canals meet. At the closest point it was only about 100 feet across the canal, the other side of which was Vietcong territory. The house had been hit frequently by enemy small arms and mortar fire. The roof was holed, and there were enemy mortar shell fragments in every square foot of the yard. Because they were often in the middle of combat as soon as they jumped from their beds at night, the Americans slept in special uniforms—black pajamas. These are the best, most convenient camouflage for night fighting. (When I complained because they didn't have any black pj's for me, I was chided for my poor sportsmanship. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "The Vietcong have to have something to shoot at, don't they?")

As is usual in Vietnam, the four men who represented America in Mo Cay served their country as both soldiers and diplomats. They were diplomatic in the way in which they gave suggestions, and they were very well liked by the Arvin officers and enlisted men. They ate local dishes—with chopsticks—and could even speak some Vietnamese. During my short stay with them I saw many examples of their good work.

Action in the Mo Cay area was frequent—and often bloody. On the night before Christmas Eve a VC battalion carried on an all-night attack against a small outpost defended by only 17 Arvin. When the battle was broken off by the Communists at dawn, there were only three Vietnamese boys left standing. But they had held their post.